



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/877,181	06/11/2001	Carie J. Wimberly	BS00-049	1233

45695 7590 09/26/2006

WITHERS & KEYS FOR BELL SOUTH
P. O. BOX 71355
MARIETTA, GA 30007-1355

EXAMINER

ARAQUE JR, GERARDO

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3629

DATE MAILED: 09/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/877,181	WIMBERLY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Gerardo Araque Jr.	3629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 March 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 June 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 2 – 20** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson et al. (US Patent 6,058,380).
4. In regards to **claims 2, 8, 14, and 16**, Anderson discloses a system and method for automating error processing and correction in legacy usage and billing systems comprising of receiving a set of error processing rules in a master database to be executed by a processor and applied to a plurality of defective billing records (Column 3 Lines 25 – 29, Column 16 Lines 65 – 67); receiving a plurality of defective billing records from billing systems to a master database (Column 3 Lines 37 – 40); categorizing a plurality of defective billing records by a defined error code (Column 6 Lines 5 – 9); presenting the categorized received billing records for an administrative review (Column 2 Lines 26 – 28); accepting ad hoc sets of error processing rules (Column 8 Lines 57 –

67; Column 14 Lines 34 – 38); applying the sets of defined and ad hoc error processing rules to the plurality of defective billing records to correct the billing records (Column 2 Lines 14 – 18; Column 8 Lines 57 – 67); sending a warning when a defective billing record is encountered by one or more error processing rules that has an undefined error code (Column 14 Table 12); sending corrected billing records to their corresponding billing systems for further processing (Column 7 Lines 30 – 32).

However, Anderson fails to explicitly disclose the use of an administrative override when accepting ad hoc sets of error processing rules. Nonetheless, it is an old and well-known business method to have some sort of administrative override for special situation. One such example is when a credit card customer calls in to inform to the credit card company that they have yet to receive a credit card bill. Normally the system would mark the customer down as a late payment, but with an administrative override it makes it possible for the credit card company to override the automatic system in order to excuse the customer from incurring any late charges.

5. In regard to **claims 3, 9, and 20**, Anderson discloses wherein the processing rule includes a description of the rule, a rule start date, a rule end date, and a rule maximum rule duration (Column 2 Lines 31 – 43).

6. In regard to **claims 4 and 10**, Anderson discloses wherein the processing rule is manually extended, modified, deleted and copied into a new rule (Column 9 Lines 7 – 11).

7. In regard to **claims 5, 11, and 17**, Anderson discloses wherein a warning is sent when a predetermine threshold is met limiting the total number of records received from the billing systems (Column 9 Lines 32 – 35).

8. In regard to **claims 6, 12, and 18**, Anderson discloses wherein the processing rules are applied to individual errors and to classes of errors in a batch process (inherently included as laid out in the various tables found throughout Anderson).

9. In regard to **claims 7, 13, and 19**, Anderson discloses balancing volume flows of defective billing records and sending a warning when an out of balance condition exists (Column 9 Lines 32 – 35; Table 3).

10. In regards to **claim 15**, it is implied in Anderson that a graphical user interface is used in order to carry the disclosed processes, such as an administrative override/review, the processes that have been discussed above.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments filed March 23, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

12. In regards to the arguments on Page 6 ¶ 2, examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant's argument made against Anderson. In order for the reports to be generated on an ad hoc basis the reports must first be **accepted** and the ad hoc error processing rules and administrative overrides **must be used** in order to generate the reports.

13. In regards to the arguments on Page 6 ¶ 3, it is implied in Anderson that the system will send out a warning when an unidentified error code has been detected. It is

further common business practice to have such a feature because one is unable to fully determine all possible outcomes, i.e. it would have been obvious to have a feature to warn an administrator, or the like, in the event that specific situation does not fall within a predetermined set of criteria/scenarios.

14. In regards to the arguments on Page 6 ¶ 5, wherein Anderson fails to teach, "...wherein an error processing rule includes a description of the rule, a rule start date, a rule end date, and a rule maximum duration" the examiner has discussed it above.

15. In regards to the arguments on Page 6 ¶ 6, wherein Anderson fails to teach, "...wherein the processor sends a warning when a predetermined threshold is met limiting the total number of records received into the master database from the one or more billing systems" the examiner has discussed it above.


Conclusion

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gerardo Araque Jr. whose telephone number is (571)272-3747. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:30AM - 4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Weiss can be reached on (571) 272-6812. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

GA
9/12/06



JOHN G. WEISS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600